APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,357	02/08/2001	Dwip N. Banerjee	AUS9-2000-0928-US1	5782

7590	01/27/2005

Volel Emile
International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
Internal Zip 4054, 11400 Burnet Road
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER
TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2" colspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application N .</td><td>Applicant(s)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>09/779,357</td><td>BANERJEE ET AL.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Examiner</td><td>Art Unit</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Quoc A. Tran</td><td>2176</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 June 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-39 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, and 27 are

independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

3.   **Claims 1-2, 6-15, 19-28, and 32-39, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as**

being unpatentable over Schuetze et al. US 20030074368A1- filed 10/19/1999

(hereinafter '368), in view of Chaudhry US006567103B1 - filed 08/02/2000

(hereinafter '103).

        In regard to independent claim 14, "*determining a weight for each of said*

plurality of embedded hyperlinks, prioritizing said plurality of embedded hyperlinks

based upon said weights ", as described in '368 at page 1, paragraph [0013] (i.e...

Google's metric of importance is based upon two primary factors: the number of pages

(elsewhere on the Web) that link to a page (i.e., "inlinks," defining the retrieved page as

an "authority"), and the number of pages that the retrieved page links to (i.e., "outlinks,"

defining the retrieved page as a "hub"). A page's inlinks and outlinks are weighted,

based on the Google-determined importance of the linked pages, resulting in an

importance score for each retrieved page. The search results are presented in order of decreasing score, with the most important pages presented first. It should be noted that Google's page importance metric is based on the pattern of links on the Web as a whole, and is not limited (and at this time cannot be limited) to the preferences of a single user or group of users...),

"*whereby said user may select said hyperlinks based upon said prioritizing* ", as taught by '368 at page 3, paragraph [0026] (i.e... user selects the image most similar to what they are looking for... In some systems, the user can directly specify image features such as color distribution and can also specify weights on different features, such as color histograms, texture, and shape. In web pages... Current image retrieval technology also allows the use of URL, alt tags, and hyperlink text to index images on the web....),

'368 does not explicitly teach," *visually distinguishing said plurality of embedded hyperlinks from each other based upon said prioritizing...* ", as taught by '103 at col. 3, lines 20-40 (i.e. ... The predetermined variable time interval to display each frame is based on the relevance or score of the hyperlink (search result) to which the frame refers. ...), also as taught by '103 at col. 5, lines 30-35 (i.e. ... FIG. 6 ...illustrating a method 110 for determining the display time for a search result in accordance with the invention... the SCORE value may be based on the relevance of the document that a search engine assigns to the document as a weight wherein 1.00 is the highest score and 0.01 is the lowest score ...).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have modified '103 into '368 to provide a way, wherein visually
distinguishing said plurality of embedded hyperlinks from each other based upon said
prioritizing. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this
combination to provide the user with textual and graphical search result information
about each search result, so that a user may more easily review and analyze the search
results, as taught by '103 at col. 1, lines 40-55 (i.e.... a user may more easily review
and analyze the search results...).

In regard to dependent claim 15, " *selectively highlighting a set of said plurality*
of embedded hyperlinks ", as taught by '368 at page 3, paragraph [0026] (i.e... user
selects the image most similar to what they are looking for... In some systems, the user
can directly specify image features such as color distribution and can also specify
weights on different features, such as color histograms, texture, and shape. In web
pages...Current image retrieval technology also allows the use of URL, alt tags, and
hyperlink text to index images on the web. One approach also attempts to determine for
each word surrounding an image caption whether it is likely to be a caption word and
then matches caption words to "visual foci" or regions of images (such as the
foreground). The Webseek image search engine and MARS-2 allow for relevance
feedback on images by marking them as positive or negative exemplars...).

In regard to dependent claims 20 incorporates substantially similar subject
matter as cited in claim 14, and therefore is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 21, " *the frequency with which the linked hypertext document is universally accessed from the Web* ", as taught by '368 at page 3, paragraph [124] (i.e... among users in a user population,... page usage has been found to be indicative of users' information-seeking preferences. For the page usage modality, page accesses are first identified (step 810). The token frequency weight (step 812) and inverse context frequency weight (step 814) are again preferably used, the context being each user and a token being a user's page accesses...).

In regard to dependent claims 22, "" *the notoriety of the linked hypertext document* " ", as taught by '368 at page 3, paragraph [124] (i.e... among users in a user population,... page usage has been found to be indicative of users' information-seeking preferences. For the page usage modality, page accesses are first identified (step 810). The token frequency weight (step 812) and inverse context frequency weight (step 814) are again preferably used, the context being each user and a token being a user's page accesses...).

In regard to dependent claims 23, and 24 are directed to a web browser for performing the method of claim 14, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 25 directed to a web browser for performing the method of claim 15, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 26, " *prefetching from the Web hypertext documents respectively linked to said set of embedded hyperlinks prior to a user selection of any of said set of hyperlinks* ", as described in '368 at page 1, paragraph [0013] (i.e... Google's metric of importance is based upon two primary factors: the

number of pages (elsewhere on the Web) that link to a page (i.e., "inlinks," defining the

retrieved page as an "authority"), and the number of pages that the retrieved page links

to (i.e., "outlinks," defining the retrieved page as a "hub"). A page's inlinks and outlinks

are weighted, based on the Google-determined importance of the linked pages,

resulting in an importance score for each retrieved page. The search results are

presented in order of decreasing score, with the most important pages presented first. It

should be noted that Google's page importance metric is based on the pattern of links

on the Web as a whole, and is not limited (and at this time cannot be limited) to the

preferences of a single user or group of users...).

In regard to independent claim 19, " *wherein said step of selectively*

highlighting said set of hyperlinks includes only activating said set of hyperlinks ", as

taught by '368 at page 3, paragraph [124] (i.e... among users in a user population,...

page usage has been found to be indicative of users' information-seeking preferences.

For the page usage modality, page accesses are first identified (step 810). The token

frequency weight (step 812) and inverse context frequency weight (step 814) are again

preferably used, the context being each user and a token being a user's page

accesses...).

In regard to independent claims 1, and 27 are directed to a web

communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the

method of claim 14, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 2, and 28 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 15, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 6, and 32 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 19, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 7, and 33 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 20, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 8, and 34 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 21, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 9, and 35 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 22, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 10, and 36 are directed to a web communication network system with a web search engine and a computer program including a web search program for performing the method of claim 23, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 11, and 37 are directed to a web communication network system and a computer program with a web browser program for performing the method of claim 24, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 12, and 38 are directed to a web communication

network system and a computer program with a web browser program for performing

the method of claim 25, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 13, and 39 are directed to a web communication

network system and a computer program with a web browser program for performing

the method of claim 26, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

4.   **Claims 3-5, 16-18, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Schuetze et al. US 20030074368A1- filed 10/19/1999 (hereinafter

'368), in view of Chaudhry US006567103B1 - filed 08/02/2000 (hereinafter '103), in

further view of Wattenberg US 20040205575A1; provisional No. 60/283,790 - filed

08//2001 (hereinafter '770).

In regard to dependent claims 16-18, '368 and '103 do not explicitly teach,

varying the brightness of said set of hyperlinks, varying the color of said set of

hyperlinks, blinking said set of hyperlinks, however as taught by '962 at page 5,

paragraph [0061] (i.e... The term "hyperlink" is used herein in its conventional sense,

preferably referring to a predefined linkage between one object and another. A hyperlink

can be displayed on the page as either text or an icon (symbol) or underlining or

shading... by blinking or underlining or color....).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified '962 into '368 and '103 to provide a way, wherein

varying the brightness of said set of hyperlinks; varying the color of said set of

hyperlinks, blinking said set of hyperlinks. One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to modify this combination to provide the user with textual and graphical

search result information about each search result, so that a user may more easily

review and analyze the search results, as taught by '103 at col. 1, lines 40-55 (i.e.... a

user may more easily review and analyze the search results...).

In regard to dependent claims 3-5, and 29-31 are directed to a web

communication network system and a computer readable medium for performing the

method of claims 16-18, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Argument

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-39 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Amit et al	US 20040043770A1	filed 07/08/2001
Wattenberge	US 20040205575A1	filed 04/12/2002

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM

to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

_____

Quoc A. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
January 11, 2005